

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response to Non-Final Office Action is being submitted in response to the non-final Office Action Mailed August 28th 2006 Claims 21-22-25&30-37. 1-20 are pending in the Application. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S. C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 21,22,25,30 34-37 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balne (U.S.) pat No.3068,002). Claims 13,15,17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davidson (U.S. Pat No. 5,674,159). Claims 6and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Simonson U.S. Pat No. 6,770,015). Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Clark (U.S.Pat No. 5,234,392). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Goodwin (U.S. Pat No.2,951,702). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Balne (U.S. Pat No. 3,068,002) in view of Knudsen et al.(U.S.) Pat.App.No.2004/0069132)

Applicant notes that as we discussed in our telephone confrence each one of the references cited by the Examiner discloses an exercise device and only works the abdominal muscle. Except Freyman which is clearly for stabilization. In the field of medicine as we discussed we can no longer tie patient down not even for their own safety without a doctors order. So even his device would be considered obsolete . Freymans device would still cause the patient to push in their face and not in their perineum or rectal area where it is need to help with delivery. Please reconsider that The wording has been changed to fit what the rope actually does and that the loops aren't used for anything except to keep me as a nurse to keep from handing it to my patient a hundred and fifty times. I am sending you a drawing that I give to some of the mothers in our child birth classes that wish to try the rope to better under stand where her hands go. Please reconsider my patent. I simply redirects their pushing efforts. No New matter has been added the wording from abdomin to perineal and rectal areas have been changed Thank you for you time.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS:

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner states that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Applicant has submitted new drawings showing the source a source of resistance.

However, the Examiner is incorrect in his requirement that the Applicant show each claimed handhold unit, and each composition of rope or cable of which the birthing aide can be constructed. Applicant has shown in the Figures the handhold unit and the connecting line/elongated cord. As such, these physical structures are shown in the claims. Applicant has no duty to show every possible embodiment of the claims in the figures. Respectfully, the Examiner is mistaken as to this point.

Claim Objections:

Claims 1, 5, and 17 stand objected due to informalities. Claims 1, 5, and 17 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 19 stands objected due to informalities. Claim 19 has been cancelled. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. 101:

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Applicant has cancelled Claim 10. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 11, 12, and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Balne:

Claims 1-5, 11, 12, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Balne (U.S. Pat. No. 3,068,002).

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-5, 11, 12, and 20. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 13-15, 17, and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Davidson:

Claims 13-15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davidson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,674,159).

Applicant has cancelled claims 13-15, 17, and 18. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 6 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) - Simonson:

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simonson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,770,015).

Applicant has cancelled claims 6 and 7. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Clark:

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clark (U.S. Pat. No. 5,234,392).

Applicant has cancelled claim 9. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Goodwin:

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goodwin (U.S. Pat. No. 2,951,702).

Applicant has cancelled claim 16. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 16 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – Balne in view of Knudsen et al.:

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Balne (U.S. Pat. No. 3,068,002) in view of Knudsen et al. (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2004/0069132).

Applicant has cancelled claim 8. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.